

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above Amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed March 30, 2005, claims 10, 13 - 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 have been rejected, claims 11, 12, 21 - 23, 26 and 29 have been objected to and claims 1 and 3 - 9 have been allowed. In response, the Applicants have submitted the following remarks, cancelled claims 11, 21 and 26 and amended claims 10, 19 and 24. Accordingly, claims 1, 3 - 10, 12 - 19, 22 - 25 and 27 - 31 are pending. Applicants also acknowledge the Examiner's Amendment to claims 3, 4, 22, and 23, and have incorporated the Amendments into the listing of claims without underline or strikethrough. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and the remarks below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,688,057 to Wright, et al (hereinafter Wright). Within the Office Action, it is stated that claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claim 19 to include the limitation of claim 21. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Wright.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, claims 10, 13 - 18, 23 - 25, 27 - 28, 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,509,530 to Curtis, et al (hereinafter Curtis). It also stated within the Office Action that claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but will be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim

10 to include the limitations of claim 11. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Wright and Curtis.

Claims 13 - 18 are dependent upon the independent claim 10. As discussed above, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Wright and Curtis. Accordingly, claims 13 - 18 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 24 is dependent upon the independent claim 19. As discussed above, the independent claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Wright. Accordingly, claim 23 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

It was also stated within the Office Action that claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 24 to include the limitations of claim 26. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Wright and Curtis.

Claims 25, 27 - 28, 30 and 31 are dependent upon the independent claim 24. As discussed above, the independent claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Wright and Curtis. Accordingly, claims 25, 27 - 28, 30 and 31 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Within the Office Action, claims 11, 12, 21, 22, 26 and 29 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As described above, claims 11, 21 and 26 have been cancelled and the limitations of these claims have been rewritten in independent form in claims 10, 19 and 24, respectively.

Claims 12, 22 and 29 are dependent upon the independent claims 10, 19 and 24, respectively. As discussed above, the independent claims 10, 19 and 24 are allowable

Application No. 09/681,229

Amendment dated _____

Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

over the teachings of Wright and Curtis. Accordingly, claims 12, 22 and 29 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 - 9 have been allowed. The Applicants respectfully acknowledge and thank the Examiner for allowable subject matter.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at 414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By



Christopher M. Scherer

Reg. No. 50,655

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Telephone: (414) 271-7590
Facsimile: (414) 271-5770